I6. Tac. Ann. 1, 27, 2 'nec multo post digredientem eum a Caesare ac provisi periculi hiberna castra repetentem'. No previous visit to this winter camp is recorded by Tacitus.

17. Tac. Ann. 1, 24, 1. They may well have been accompanied by some of the Praetorian cavalry and the German bodyguards (Ann. 1, 24, 2). Wellesley (art. cit., 25) rejects the supposition, also advanced by Brunt (JRS 51, 1961, 238), that the main body of troops left Rome before Drusus. He believes that evidence of haste would have provided Tacitus with a gibe too good to miss. Yet this is mere assumption; and there is nothing in Tacitus' narrative, which omits all details of the journey to Pannonia, to prove that Drusus and the troops travelled together. Nor is Wellesley convincing on the difficulties of arranging a rendezvous. For an answer to Wellesley's final point—Tiberius' reasons for wanting Drusus to be present at the meeting of the senate—see below.

19. 57, 3, 1.
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CONSTANTINE AND CRISPUS, A.D. 326*

The execution of Crispus in 326 was an episode surrounded by obscurity in antiquity; it has received some attention from modern scholarship, but without much positive result. The discussion which follows attempts to break some new ground in proposing that the usual explanations of treason, adultery or palace plots do not meet the circumstances depicted by what evidence is available, but rather that Crispus was detected in the use of magic, and had his position and activities misrepresented to Constantine.

The starting point for this study was an article published in 1966, in which Patrick Guthrie advanced a novel if unconvincing explanation for the sudden removal of the Caesar. ¹ He based his argument on the pervasive post-eventum theory of Eusebius that Constantine's central concern in his position as vicerger of God on earth was the justification of the possession of his absolute temporal powers by exercising them in the interests of his subject. An important part of the justification, Guthrie suggested, would therefore rest on the transmission of the imperial powers to legitimate heirs; Crispus in his view was illegitimate and could not succeed, and because he would therefore be a very serious embarrassment to the legitimate sons, was executed in a dynastic murder. ² This kind of argument can only be sustained if it can be shown that the legitimate transmission of his powers did in fact exercise Constantine to the extent that his possibly illegitimate and very successful son would need to be got rid of in order to protect and advance the interests of the much younger but legitimate sons; further, evidence would have to be led showing that there is a direct connection between the Eusebian Constantine's ideological role as emperor and the record of his personal conduct—and such evidence does not exist.
The legitimacy problem must be disposed of first. The real upshot of the biographer-panegyrist Eusebius’ presentation is that Constantine wields authority on earth on God’s behalf and with his approval. The transmission of this authority clearly must be a matter of concern to a ruler so distinctively marked out, but legitimacy or otherwise of birth appears to pose no problem. Eusebius makes the point that the law of nature requires dynastic succession, in that just as Constantine received his powers from his father, he is passing it on to his sons and their descendants, θεομος φυσεως. In practice, Constantine did not regard the θεομος φυσεως as restrictively meaning that only legitimate sons descended from himself could inherit imperial power, since at his death divisions of the empire were to be administered by the three surviving sons, Constantine II, Constantius II and Constans, and by his half-brother’s sons, Delmatius and Hannibalianus (this last receiving the important client-kingdom of Armenia): there is no close monopoly of legitimacy here. It would be a surprising inconsistency, moreover, if it were solely on the grounds of illegitimacy that Constantine were to abandon Crispus, a clearly-designated and apparently able successor-son in favour of untested children years younger. With that issue out of the way, the next question is Constantine’s attitude towards his family and the career of Crispus. It is quite true that Constantine was interested in the problems surrounding family life: he shows it in the hard-line legislation preventing bastards from inheriting anything from their fathers, and associated with this is the divorce legislation; his concern in both areas is attributed by Jones to the progressive Christianisation in Constantine’s thinking. But, ironically, on both these scores Constantine was personally on unsure ground. For instance, we cannot be certain that his mother Helena was married to Constantius Chlorus, and even if she were, she would have had to be divorced to allow Constantius to marry Theodora. In any case, because of her humble origins, she was certainly kept in the background until her son created her Augusta in November 324. Dispute also exists over the legality of Constantine’s own first union, with Minervina the mother of Crispus: whatever her formal legal status, she too was not allowed to share in Constantine’s rise and was definitively out of the family circle once he married Maximian’s younger daughter Fausta in 307. Minervina’s son though was from adolescence marked out for substantial advancement—at age 14, in 317, he was created Caesar, along with his infant half-brother Constantine II and his cousin Licinius II; in 318, 321 and 324 (at age 15, 18 and 21) he held the consulship; he was nominal head of the government of Gaul (obviously, professionally assisted by a praefectus praetorio), and achieved military success; in 324, he materially contributed to Constantine’s last campaign against Licinius. Crispus continued his rise in status, right to the end of his life figuring prominently on both the gold and the bronze coinage (our only source), and manifestly superior to Constantine II. His whereabouts during 325 cannot be positively identified: he did not apparently return to the West, so presumably accompanied Constantine and the court at the vicennalia.
celebrations commencing at Nicomedia on 25 July 325. This would accord with
the precedent of the quindecennalia when the Caesars had clearly joined their
father at Sirmium in early 321 for the opening of their own almost overlapping
quinquennalia.\textsuperscript{13} Much the same can be said for the first half of 326, with the
progress of the court westwards to Rome, where Crispus met and obviously
impressed Helena, who had been living there quietly since 312.\textsuperscript{14} But at some
point after the vicennalia year ended and the court had left Rome to return to
Sirmium by way of Milan, Crispus was spirited away from court across the
Adriatic, to be suddenly executed at Pola in Istria.\textsuperscript{15} Shortly afterwards followed
the deaths of the empress Fausta and of others. But in a reign stigmatised by few
such executions of high officials, Crispus' removal seems inexplicable.\textsuperscript{16}

Many explanations for his fall have been advanced, ranging from simple
treason to more prurient combinations of adultery and palace plots. But
basically all have to be speculative, since Crispus and (soon afterwards) Fausta
met their ends without trial or publicity: both suffered a form of damnatio
memoriae and were not rehabilitated in Constantine's lifetime.\textsuperscript{17} Eusebius,
usually the most informed and detailed source, is here almost useless, while
others give little enough solid fact under their cloaks of guesswork. Proven or
plausible charges of adultery and/or treason are spectacular enough to have
been made much of by contemporaries, since in one area Constantine's own
personal morality and the moral legislation emphasise his attitudes, while
treason detected and avoided would be a useful whipping-boy for panegyric. A
few tempting suggestions are given by Eutropius, making the palace-plot theory
superficially more attractive—apart from Crispus and Fausta, there are Licinius
II and numerosi amici.\textsuperscript{18} In Zosimus' embroidered and hostile account, clash of
interest between Helena and Fausta is responsible for the subsequent elimination
of Fausta.\textsuperscript{19} The facts of the purge stop there. But if there had genuinely been
such an intrigue against the emperor, why is Eusebius so vague, and why does he
fail to elaborate material which can only suit his purpose?

It has often been noticed that Eusebius becomes vague and unsatisfactory, or
simply silent, when dealing with material that reflects disparagingly on his
subject, e.g. Maximian's last desperate 'plot', justifying an official claim of
suicide, and the execution of Licinius in Thessalonica, in spite of a promise of
safety made at his surrender at Nicomedia.\textsuperscript{20} The Crispus execution fits well into
this scheme. Constantine's vicennalia were celebrated in 325 in Nicomedia and in
326 in Rome, but Eusebius is much more interested in the religious side of the
celebrations and deals only with the Nicomedia material, omitting completely
the difficult Italian events.\textsuperscript{21} The deliberate nature of this silence suggests that,
again, Constantine was in the wrong in the same way as in the earlier incidents.
Coupled with the fact that no positively identifiable rehabilitation of Crispus
was undertaken, it seems that the whole train of events was acutely embarrassing
to the emperor, and silence was subsequently deemed the best course. It is
possibly worth noting that in the comparable context of Eusebius' assertion that
Maximian really did plot against Constantine's life, he alludes to tòν πρός
γένος ἕτεροι who were also caught plotting later—‘the other people from the family circle’, meaning Bassianus and Senecio whose efforts were revealed to Constantine by God through a dream in 316. The impression created by the use of ἕτεροι is suggestive, implying as it could do that there were no others who plotted against him to any dangerous extent. The palace-plot theory and charges of extensive conspiracy centred around Crispus therefore fall away.

Here perhaps it may be appropriate to bring up the matter of Constantine’s shortness of temper when crossed: he could be irate on paper when dealing with intransigent people and intractable problems, and there is no doubt that a similar pattern of behaviour would have shown itself on occasion in day-to-day matters. In the aftermath of Nicaea with all its pressures and the hard search for unity, this seems particularly obvious. So, a palace row over an aspect of imperial policy or religious concerns may easily have erupted, and while it should have been transient, in the mind of Constantine it could have taken on the appearance of a plot against him, or been represented by others as one. Religion cannot be ruled out altogether in view of Orosius’ remarks—he appends the executions to a passage dealing with measures taken to suppress Arianism, but confesses that the real reasons for the executions are unknown. It could have been a political matter seeing that the younger Licinius was in some way involved (he could have been no more than 11 years old, so that his role was not an active one); Crispus was by now 23, and had found his feet in the world, a man with brilliant prospects: an incident involving an unwise remark, that Constantine was now expendable, for example, would have been particularly enraging in that tense atmosphere.

It is clear that Eutropius’ ‘numerosi amici’ must be an exaggeration. The only known associates of Crispus were his supervisory praefecti praetorio, Vettius Rufinus and his successor in Gaul Iunius Bassus. Neither suffered any obvious impediment to his career: the former was possibly the consul of 323 and thus does not fall into the purview of this study; the latter succeeded Ablabius as PPO of Italy in 329 and reached the consulship in 331. Much more rewarding is a fascinating hypothesis advanced by Barnes: he posits some connection between Crispus’ execution and the contemporary exile for adultery and magic of his co-eval Ceionius Rufius Albinus, who early in his exile was unexpectedly recalled and subsequently enjoyed rapid and sustained promotion. Barnes admits that solid evidence for such a connection is lacking. About the adultery, nothing fruitful can be guessed, but the circumstances and consequences of the charge of magic allow speculation that fits the available evidence well. It looks then very much as if a small group around Crispus had overstepped the mark by dabbling in magic to foretell his future career: this must have been discovered by Fausia, who saw the situation as favourable for advancing her sons and passed the information on to Constantine. The information was delicate and difficult to handle, but it appeared trustworthy: its source on an earlier occasion was reputedly instrumental in saving Constantine from her own father. If it was represented as a plot, it required a rapid and secret response without trial.
Subsequent suspicions and investigations, perhaps prompted by the anger of Helena, revealed alleged misconduct by Fausta and other associates, and the fact that the execution of Crispus had been a mistake. Regret and silence are characteristics of the sequel: dynastic murder had not been the issue.

NOTES

* I must acknowledge the generous and helpful criticisms of an earlier version of this paper, made by Professor Averil Cameron of King's College, London; but the errors which may remain are my own responsibility.

1. 'The execution of Crispus', Phoenix 20 (1966) 325-331; Appendix B to the article was important in establishing the legitimacy of Constantine II, now greatly strengthened by T.D. Barnes, 'Lactantius and Constantine', JRS 63 (1973) 36, 38.


3. Vita Constantini I. 3; I. 6; 1. 24; 2. 28. 2-29. 1; Laudes Constantini 3. 4-5; 5. 1 ff.

4. VC 1. 9. 2. 21. 2. It is interesting that Zosimus 2. 29. 2 uses the same words, θερμόδο φύσεως, in his claim that the execution of Crispus was contrary to the law of nature.

5. Eusebius HE 10. 9. 6. Crispus is τά πάντα τοῦ πατρὸς δίνοις which is as close as Eusebius will get to saying outright 'his successor'.


7. Zosimus 2. 8. 2; Victor Caes. 41. 11.


9. J.R. Palanque, 'Chronologie constantinienne', REA 40 (1938) 245 f., and Jones, 60, regard Minervina as a wife, basing their view on Pan. Lat. 7. 4. 1, which is the earliest reference to the relationship and calls it 'matrimonium'. Three items may cast doubt on this:

(a) how is Constantine able to marry Minervina if he was already betrothed to the young Fausta c293 (cf. Palanque, 244, referring to Pan. Lat. 7. 6. 2 and 7. 1)?

(b) if Minervina had died before the marriage with Fausta, why is the blameless word 'widower' avoided in the panegyric?

(c) how far can a panegyrist's use, after the event, of the word 'uxorious', 'animus maritalis', 'matrimonium' be regarded as definitive? Palanque, 247 n.1. even suggests that the projected marriage with Fausta was abandoned during the alienation of Constantius Chlorus and Maximian, but was resurrected 14 years later. More likely is the view that Pan. Lat. 7. 4. 1. could be taken to mean that Constantine's marriageability to a girl of appropriate high rank was designated and committed for him in 293, but in order to safeguard the continentia universally attributed to him, the permanent liaison with Minervina was allowed, cf. the view of her as an inaequalis coniunx advanced by X. Lucien-Brun, 'Minervine, épouse ou coacubine?'; BAGB (1970) 403.


11. Palanque dates Crispus' birth to 303, most persuasively; J. Vogt, Constantin der Grosse und sein Jahrhundert, München (Münchner Verlag) 1949, 143, less convincingly to 305.

12. Shown by the increasing use of the broken obverse legends particularly after 324, Bruun, RIC 7, 28 etc.


15. Ammianus 14. 11. 20. in a striking collocation with the execution of Gallus in 353. The chronology of court movements around the time of the execution is suggested by Bruun, Studies, 66-7, and RIC 7, 71-2.

16. E.g. Constantine's σύνεδρος Sopater: Eunapius VSoph 462-3 and Zosimus 2. 40. 3.

17. CIL 3. 7172; ILS 708, 710; AE (1975) 135; as examples of deletion of one or both names. The abolitio may not have been extensively applied, cf. the retention of the name by the equites
Crispian in Britain, *Not. Dig. Occ.* 40, and a fair number of inscriptions, *ILS* 712–4, 716–7; *AE* (1975) 765c; *PLRE* Crispus 4. Fausta’s rehabilitation occurred soon after Constantine’s death, *AE* (1952) 107 (337–340), and was strengthened later, Julian Or. 1. 5D, 7D, 2. 51C, and particularly 1. 9B–C. Proven adultery on her part would not have allowed such favourable comment.

18. 10. 6. 3.
19. 2. 29. 2; also *Epit. de Caes.* 41. 11.
20. *VC* 1. 47. 1; 2. 18. Jones, 135.
23. Eutropius mentions the change from his well-known earlier *favorabilis animi docilitas*, 10. 6. 3, as does Sozomenus, 2. 29. 1. See in particular Sozomenus *HE* 2. 21. 3–5, 7–8, both ascribable to the immediate post-Nicæa period.
24. *Hist. adv. paganos* 7. 28. 23f., misinterpreted by Guthrie, 329: *sed inter haec laeunt causae, cur vindicet gladium et destinatam in impios purificationem Constantius imperator eisam in propios egit affectus. nam Crispum filium et Licinium sororis filium intelj e cit.* The sentence *nam... interfecti* shows rather that Constantine’s actions were inexplicably directed for the moment against members of the family, not against adherents of Arianism.
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